

**Summary Minutes
City Of Sedona
Citizens Steering Committee Meeting -
Jewish Community of Sedona and the Verde Valley
100 Meadowlark Drive, Sedona, AZ
Tuesday, January 8, 2013 - 3:00 p.m.**

1. Verification of Notice, Call to Order, and Roll Call. Members of the Citizens Steering Committee will attend either in person or by internet conferencing.

Chairman Thompson explained that the Committee has some business items to address, before getting into the focus group. The Chairman thanked the focus group participants for attending and explained that Barbara Litrell had asked him to also thank those participants that she invited and extend her apologies for not being here, since she had to attend a City Council meeting. Chairman Thompson then called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m.

Roll Call:

Committee Members Present: Chairman Jon Thompson, Vice Chairman Rio Robson and Committee Members Mike Bower, Jim Eaton, Angela LeFevre, Marty Losoff, Gerhard Mayer and John Sather. Barbara Litrell and Judy Reddington were excused; Elemer Magaziner was absent.

Staff Present: Cynthia Lovely, Donna Puckett and Mike Raber

Focus Group Participants Present: Tatia Fick, Lisa Hirsch, Max Licher, Birgit Loewenstein, Ron Maassen, Sandy Moriarty, Cynthia Nasta, Joanie Wolter, John Neville and Wendy Phenom.

2. Announcements from staff and committee.

Mike Raber introduced Cynthia Lovely, Associate Planner, to the Committee and indicated that Cynthia has a great background in long-range planning from both New Mexico and Coconino County, and she is already doing great work for the City of Sedona. Mike also recognized Gerhard Mayer for doing a tremendous job on the displays and sandwich boards.

Mike Raber then announced that the initial run of the tabloid had been received and looked great, so kudos to Jim Eaton and Chairman Thompson for their work on that. He also thanked Jim Eaton for his work on the mailer that went out Friday, and noted that the email-blast to the different groups and the initial press releases also were sent out, plus Jim Eaton has a commentary tomorrow in the Red Rock News. Jim Eaton added that there are five different things going on now. Mike then added that several of the sandwich board signs have been delivered, but there are a few more to go, so the word is out there and hopefully we will get a good response.

Chairman Thompson added a special thanks to John Sather, his company and team for the great panels themselves; they did some amazing work and it is great to be in high gear with all of this.

3. Adoption of Minutes: December 4, 2012, December 12, 2012 and December 18, 2012

Chairman Thompson indicated that he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes for December 4, 2012, December 12, 2012 and December 18, 2012.

MOTION: *Jim Eaton so moved. Mike Bower seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried seven (7) for and zero (0) opposed. Gerhard Mayer was not present; Barbara Litrell and Judy Reddington were excused; Elemer Magaziner was absent.*

4. Public forum for items not listed on the agenda – limit of three minutes per person. (Note that the Citizens Steering Committee may not discuss or make decisions on any matter brought forward by a member of the public.) (10 minutes for items 1- 4)

Chairman Thompson opened the public forum and having no requests to speak, closed the public forum.

5. Presentation and discussion of the planning themes organized under environment, community and tourism. A focus group invited by the Citizens Steering Committee members and the public are invited to participate in the discussion. (1 hour and 15 minutes 3:10 – 4:25 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson suggested that the Committee return to seats in the audience, for the showing the video, and for the focus group participants, the Chairman explained that from this point on, the Committee is going to pretend this is one of the meetings announced for January 16, 17 and 19. Afterwards, the Committee will take some time to get the focus group's reactions.

At 3:10 p.m., the "big band" music video was played, followed by Mike Raber who thanked the participants for coming and noted that the group had been asked to help the Committee refine and organize this presentation. He then acknowledged that the Citizens Steering Committee is present and very interested in their input. The opening DVD narrated by Jim Eaton was then played, which highlights the Citizens Steering Committee's efforts and explains the three general categories of Environment, Tourism and Community, the common ideas, and the Committee's current need to find the right balance for one shared vision of Sedona.

Mike Bower explained that this group is not the Committee's first focus group; the Committee had a few others that weren't really set-up to be focus groups, but we did take their feedback and we will go through a little preamble to address some of the things that were brought to the Committee's attention, and one was that people need to be told what the Community Plan is.

Mike then explained that the Community Plan is actually a statement of goals and policies and it is the primary tool for guiding future development and the character of our town. Two answers were recently taken out of an *Arizona Republic* article, when Scottsdale was explaining the same thing to its citizens, and this is typically what Community Plans are. Sedona's Plan has quite a few policies and goals that are actually carried out through different tools, such as Zoning Ordinances, Capital Improvement Plans, Development Regulations, etc., so some people get a little confused and think the Community Plan is all of these regulatory documents, and it is not, it is more of a general guide.

Mike also pointed out that Community Plans have to be updated every 10 years by state law, so we are in that process now, and the important thing for us to talk about is that the Community Plan is the main place for the community to dream and have the community's vision articulated. All of those other things have to be extremely practical, drafted legally, and adopted formally as well as the Plan itself, but sometimes a criticism is that the Plan has to be practical and can't have pie-in-the-sky, so if there is any dreaming or visioning, it is interesting to note that the Plan is where that happens.

Mike then explained that it is also important to note that what you see here today for you to study is not the Plan; they are maps, but they are tools to help the Committee understand the community's vision, and participants will have to read and study these boards and the tabloid, which is a handout that will be distributed at the meetings and mailed to homes. The hope is for you, the participants, to discuss and debate these ideas and issues with each other and ultimately decide where your personal vision for our town is similar or different, and share those impressions with the Committee, because the Committee is using E, T, C to gauge your impressions and understand our community's vision. If that is done successfully, the Plan will primarily still be goals and policies, but those based on some common understanding. Many communities fail to do the visioning part in enough detail, so this is where we are now. We are heading towards understanding that vision.

John Sather explained that the focus group participants will be asked to study the panels, so he wanted to give them an overview of the panels. He then indicated that there are three boards; E for Environment, T for Tourism, and C for Community, and these are three different and distinct visions

that you will basically see an aerial photograph of the City, so you might want to orient yourself to where you live or work, etc. Some of the major areas of the City are highlighted, such as the City's boundary line, SR 89A, SR 179, Oak Creek, West Sedona, Uptown, Airport Mesa and Chapel.

John indicated that a good way to start is to read or scan, and it is set up so you don't have to read every word, because there is an overall descriptor of the visions, so if you only have a few minutes, you might just look at some of the bolded text, and if you have a little extra time, read it all. Chairman Thompson will explain that one of the give-a-ways to take home is the tabloid that has all of this in it. The Committee is trying to get some of your input today, but this is not your only opportunity. Some of it is a take-home thing, because we are asking for you to help the Committee and we need that interface.

John then explained that you are going to see a bunch of numbers that correspond to general places in town, and there is no major reason these areas were picked. The Committee just tried to give some examples of if the Community Plan really went into a vision that was much more centered around the environment, how might that play out in town, and you might look at areas like the Industrial Park and read Number 8, but if you don't have time, just pick out the red-lined highlights to get an idea. As Mike Bower said, we aren't saying this is exactly what will happen in the Plan, but it is a possibility of what might happen, so eight or ten of these areas were picked as examples.

John then pointed out the defining principles and indicated that rather than the specifics of each, which are the examples, the Community Plan is more general in nature, and these might be some of the major principles that would become part of a more environmentally-focused Plan, and all of those change as you go through E, T and C. Chairman Thompson will explain some of the process of what the Committee wants to do with blue dots, but the Committee is looking for some preferences, so you may see parts of E that you like and parts that you don't like at all, but you may also like what you see over there or you may say that the Committee didn't nail anything you have been thinking about, so in the tabloid, there is a pull-out piece, where you can give your ideas.

John also explained that the photographs shown are a little bit of eyewash, but they highlight and reinforce some of the thinking of the various themes, but since we don't want to make this a monologue, you will come to the boards pretty quickly.

Focus Group Participant 1: Indicated that she still not quite sure why she is here, because her impression was that this group was sort of a Betty Crocker test kitchen, try this plan out on the guinea pigs, and then you present it to the public-at-large, but she is getting a little different feeling here about what you are . . . , because she thought we came as quasi-representatives of certain segments of the community and our feedback would be based on a more narrow focus and how it affects that particular segment, and your group would then amalgamate this into your plan and do whatever you are going to do, and then present it to the general public. She then asked if she is off on that; she is really not quite sure what the Committee wants from them.

Chairman Thompson explained that the Committee did make an attempt to try to get people that were more of a cross-section of the community, so some retirees, some students, different age groups and economic interests, working people, etc., so the feedback we got, since it is a relatively small group, wouldn't necessarily lean one way or the other. If there are things from your perspective as a businesswoman, or whatever, that you want to specifically say, the Committee will be happy to get that input, but that aspect of it may have been a little over-presented. We were just trying to get a representative sample of the community, so it wouldn't lean one way or the other. Other than that, the intent is, as much as possible, this is the actual presentation that the Committee is going to do on the 16th, 17th and 19th, with the exception that when it is all done, instead of just wandering home, we will ask you to tell us what your experience was -- that is the main difference, and he is sorry if that wasn't made clear.

Focus Group Participant 2: Indicated that she is getting the feeling that when you have your other meetings as well; everybody will be giving their feedback as to how they accept your visions, everything you have written, and adding to it, and she then asked if this is kind of a living thing that you're going through and it will be changing all the time or is this it . . .

Chairman Thompson explained that this is not the Community Plan; this is a step that we need to go through so the Committee can draft what the community really wants, and the main aspect of that is the visioning process, so we collected all of the information from people about what they wanted in open-ended meetings, and what the Committee found was these themes that developed kind of dictated how people feel about things, and also, the Committee found that it couldn't come up with a single vision until hearing more from the public about which direction was really the right way to go, so that is why this visioning exercise, to take a look at three potential visions, maybe even inflated a little bit, to say what would a serious vision of Environment in Sedona look like in 10 years, as opposed to a Tourism or Community vision, and then by giving your feedback, the Committee will get a better idea of where we should go, in terms of writing a Plan with one single vision that we could then give back to you.

Focus Group Participant 1: Indicated that she was asked initially for input on the actual presentation itself, in other words, is it clear, putting ourselves in the view of the general public to critique how it is presented, such as if there is clarity, in addition to the substance of your vision.

Chairman Thompson indicated that is exactly right. You will go through exactly what everyone will do in the live meetings, but at the end, instead of saying you can go when you are finished, the Committee will take maybe 15 - 20 minutes to get your reactions to how we did the presentation and how much was clear or unclear, etc.

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated he might have a slightly different perspective, in terms of explaining why the Committee is doing this. As an architect, they often get initial input from their clients as to what they are looking for in the plan of their house, and then, which the Committee has already done, you have gone out to the community and gotten the initial input and all sorts of different ideas, but then they find that it works much better if they come up with three or four different design ideas to present, rather than just one, and in looking at three or four different things side-by-side, it is often much easier to see which one of those is closest to your vision and dream, and rarely is any one of those exactly what you want. You might say that you really like that, but there are aspects of this one and aspects of that one that are really good. Then, they go back to the drawing board and try to incorporate those aspects into a whole design that is really going to meet your needs as a client, and he thinks that is essentially what the Committee is doing here by showing three different ideas, and the Committee is looking for the community's feedback as to which is closest to the community's vision, but also what aspects of the other ones would they like to see integrated, and that is going to help create a Community Plan that really is a consensus vision.

Chairman Thompson then indicated that is a good segue into how you are going to tell the Committee what you think about the Community Plan, not the presentation, but the Community Plan itself. John Sather mentioned blue dots and you are going to be given some blue dots, and when you go to the boards and start studying them, you will have some of them and when you find something you like, which could be a commentary, something in a vision statement or something on the comment themes, you just stick a dot on it. As part of this whole process of working with each other as a community, you will get a chance to see what other people are thinking and maybe you will get a little discussion going and some interchange as part of that, so that is one way of providing feedback, and when we are done at the end of the day, we will take a look at where the dots are and take some pictures and get the panels ready for the next time.

The Chairman then explained that the other way to provide feedback is through the 16-page tabloid newspaper, and in it, all of the textual information is included, so the vision statements, the defining principles and all of the commentaries for the sites are presented in three different spreads, so you

may find it convenient to read about these things in the tabloid, if you can't get close enough to the boards, because we may have a lot of people in our regular meetings, but in any case, you will be able to take the tabloid home and study it further, because it is likely that you will not be able to decide exactly how you want to respond while you are here, and you may want to think about it some more and possibly discuss it with people at home or neighbors, etc. When you are ready to provide your feedback, you will use the center section. The four pages in the middle pull out and this is a response section, and there are some questions where you can indicate your preferences on the different things you liked and didn't like, in a way similar to putting blue dots on them, but you can mark as many or as few as you want and tell the Committee overall if one of the visions is more appealing to you or a combination of them, and there is a place for open-ended comments as well. You will return this to the Committee, but if you feel you can do everything you need to today, you can leave it with us or take the whole thing home and study it some more, and it tells how you can return it to us in the envelope. The other thing is, if you prefer, you can go to the website and complete the response section online. In any case, if you do respond and you are willing to give your name and contact information, the Committee will enroll you in a drawing for some terrific prizes. Three great prizes have been donated by businesses, so there will be a drawing for that in early February. The Chairman then asked if there were any questions.

Focus Group Participant 4: Asked if the Committee has considered red dots for things they don't like.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the Committee did think about that and he doesn't remember why the vote came down a certain way. John Sather then stated, "It is a positive process."

Focus Group Participant 4: Stated that there should be red dots.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the participants would adjourn to the boards and be given a copy of the tabloid, but we want to do a little role-play vignette first to give you an idea of how this might work.

From 3:35 p.m. to 3:43 p.m., Mike Bower, John Sather and Chairman Thompson performed a role-play vignette of three people discussing the old Cultural Park and Industrial Park areas shown in the Environment, Tourism and Community themes, plus the ideas that are common to all.

John Sather explained to the focus group that they were just trying to help the group understand how the Committee hopes there will be some conversations going on between people, because the Committee really wants some social interaction and discussion to occur.

Chairman Thompson then told the focus group to review the boards and indicate their preferences for the next 15 to 20 minutes and pointed out the board of common elements, if they wanted to start there.

From 3:45 p.m. to 4:05 p.m., the focus group studied the boards and used blue dots to reflect their preferences, and then the focus group reassembled to provide feedback to the Committee. The Chairman again expressed the Committee's appreciation for the focus group's participation, and explained that the Committee would now like to know what the focus group thought and get their comments on the panels themselves, the content, the process, the dots and their feeling about the overall presentation, etc.

Focus Group Participant 2: Thought the analogy that the architect gave helped a lot in understanding what the Committee's goal was in presenting these three visions to figure out what is best. She thought that might be something that would be nice to add, because it really hit the nail on the head, at least for her, in terms of exactly what you were asking for.

Chairman Thompson noted the way architects give three different ideas, so you can get a "straw man" idea, and she stated right, you might want some from this and that, to get what you really want all together.

Focus Group Participant 5: Asked if the Committee had a problem with the idea that these four main comments for each of these things -- transportation, vitality, shelter, community life, etc., have so much overlap between them, so it is easy to choose all of them. Is that an issue? He looked for key principles in each one of these and found that there was no conflict.

Chairman Thompson asked if he is referencing the left-hand side under the visions, and the participant explained that they are complementary to each other in all three themes.

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that he noticed a similar thing, but in a way, they are phrased a little differently in each one, and if it is something you really feel strongly about, he found that he put dots on all three, or the parallel ones, but in other places, he just put it on the one that was phrased and woven in the best way for him. The Committee is going to get feedback by wherever all of the dots are and the comments people make.

Focus Group Participant 5: Indicated that one thing he didn't see that came up in discussion a couple of times was more parking spaces, parking garages, etc., as a way of handling traffic, and more lanes, but he didn't see that come up anywhere either, though he heard that from people complaining about SR 179.

Chairman Thompson pointed out that the question started with asking if the Committee had a problem with that, and he would like to throw that back, because that doesn't matter. What matters is whether or not it was a problem for you.

Focus Group Participant 5: Indicated not at all, because what he liked was that you had different reasons for doing the same thing from different perspectives.

The Chairman then asked if he had an expectation that they were going to be more self-contained and unique from each other and you were surprised by that.

Focus Group Participant 5: Indicated that he was surprised that there was so much overlap. He put a blue dot by every single one of those; he liked them.

Chairman Thompson asked if it is fair to say that from your comment, what the Committee might do is try to point out that there is overlap.

Focus Group Participant 5: Stated that when you talk about the scenarios and you talk about the reason why we don't have more lanes, more parking, etc., and what you have done is go with these solutions, because they will help enhance our economy, protect our natural environment and give us a stronger sense of community, and you show that dynamic -- maybe with some data and . . .

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that what he sees is that all of the common elements that you said are common to all are the things that Focus Group Participant 5 is picking up on, so somehow emphasizing that.

Chairman Thompson explained that more specifically, they are common to the eventual Plan. They will all be in the Plan, and in most cases, you can find those things woven throughout, but the point is that you don't have to decide on them; they are going in the Plan.

Focus Group Participant 1: Indicated that she mentioned some of these points to John Sather and she has to write them down, but one thing that occurred to her is when you have a large group, let's call it 30 to 50 people, perhaps you could organize it either by time and try having Group A go to Panel 1, and then in 10 minutes move on to Panel 2, so you don't have everybody congregating

at one place. The other thing is that she would suggest a number for your dots, to make it simple, maybe one to three or one to four, with one being the least attractive or you like it, but you aren't super enthused, and then four being wow, this is great. She really doesn't sense that this is going to be as much of a feedback type of thing, because there were many times she was reading a paragraph and there would be two sentences where she said she really didn't like that part of it, although she liked some of it, so for a little more accuracy, she personally thinks either numbers or a coloring system would be better.

Chairman Thompson asked how other people feel about the whole dot business.

Focus Group Participant 6: Indicated that the dots are a good visual tool; it conveys the sense, but it doesn't convey the strength of the sense, but it does convey the sense.

Focus Group Participant 4: Indicated that he would agree with Focus Group Participant 1 in that there needs to be some discrimination in the dots, be it the color or number or something, because much like her, he would read one and say he is really gung-ho on bicycle paths and blah, blah, and then he would get to something else in the same paragraph and say that is a bad idea, so you need some discrimination.

Focus Group Participant 7: Indicated that she sort of solved that by putting the dot next to the sentence that she liked and if she liked the whole thing, she put it on the top, but on some of the cultural park things under Tourism, she liked some of it, but not other stuff, so she put a dot next to the ones she liked and left the dot away from the ones she didn't.

Chairman Thompson asked if she felt she was able to communicate her preferences okay with the dots.

Focus Group Participant 7: Indicated yes, but in the back of her head, she thought she would probably be able to communicate them better in the tabloid with highlighting notes or whatever. What she sends back would be more in the tabloid, and these (on the boards) would just be general. When you are done, you are going to see blue dots in lots of different places, and you will probably use it more to figure out where the blue dots were not, and you can get rid of some things.

Focus Group Participant 3: Added that the Committee might address that upfront and say that the blue dots are going to sort of be general indications of overall things here, and if you have specific issues with certain things you like, please make written comments in the tabloid, or something as simple as that.

Chairman Thompson asked what if people were asked to write on their dots, something like "bad" or "!!!", to show some preference.

Focus Group Participant 7: Stated, "Sure."

Focus Group Participant 1: Indicated that or numbers; numbers rating them really.

Focus Group Participant 4: Stated, "Red dots."

Focus Group Participant 8: Pointed out that if you try to make it more complicated with numbers and stuff, the Committee is going to find it so hard to tally things she cannot tell you.

Chairman Thompson agreed that we have to set expectations as to how much data we can really pull from this accurately, but all comments are great, and he wants to make sure everyone on the Committee asks any questions they have too.

Vice Chairman Robson asked, if comments are written on the dots, who is going to read every dot, and then it goes back to the same thing. What happens if the dots start overlapping?

Chairman Thompson suggested that the Committee not evaluate, just take input, and Vice Chairman Robson indicated that he was just giving some feedback on it.

Mike Bower indicated that years ago he attended a Focused Futures Group and they did a blue dot thing, but they only gave them a limited number of dots, and the Committee was seeing what you would do if you got a lot of dots, but how would you feel if you only had seven dots, so in a way you wouldn't have to number them, because they are all important and you only have seven spots that you could weigh-in on . . . he is getting a no.

Focus Group Participant 8: Indicated no, that is too few.

Focus Group Participant 5: Indicated that he wanted two more dots. Several other members of the focus group indicated their agreement that they also wanted more.

Focus Group Participant 2: Added that there is a lot to absorb at one sitting to only have seven dots.

Focus Group Participant 1: Noted that you are also going to have crowd control and it is too much. It is a lot of information to take in, in a short time, and make an evaluation.

Mike Bower acknowledged that is good feedback.

Angela LeFevre asked when the tabloids are going out, and Chairman Thompson explained that they will be distributed at the meetings, and the Monday after the meetings, they will be sent to every home. Angela then indicated that she was going to say that if they were sent the Monday before, people would have some chance to read it beforehand, because it is tough to get it all now. If they had a chance to read it beforehand, that would be fantastic.

Chairman Thompson then asked about the focus group's reaction to the role play.

Focus Group Participant 4: Indicated it was a waste of time; he would rather have had the time to study the text than to have you guys banter about things that really weren't particularly meaningful to him.

Focus Group Participant 1: Suggested also giving a little more instruction, and maybe have one of the fellows explain how they integrate and what the participants should be looking for in these things, so we can help the Committee. That would be more helpful than the role play. Also, she would immediately get the audience involved in it, like within five minutes, after you have done your intros, etc., get them right to the boards.

Focus Group Participant 6: Thought they were fun, but could be shortened. It loosened the transition from your more formal presentation to that.

Chairman Thompson asked, regardless of the bad acting or bad timing, etc., were there things said that helped, when you got to the boards.

Focus Group Participant 4: Stated, "No."

Focus Group Participant 6: Indicated that it gives you the train of thought to look at it this way and that way as well. You might have that thought anyway, but it is a long intermission between getting from Panel A to the same point on Panel B, etc, so you might want to follow that pattern.

John Sather asked if the participants felt led in any way, recognizing it was poorly done, because they had just decided on the script this morning, but the Committee is clearly trying not to lead anyone.

Focus Group Participant 6: Stated, "No, she did not feel that; she just thought it was fun." Other focus group members indicated agreement that they also did not feel led.

Marty Losoff reported that if you count the blue dots, there were 34 dots under Environment, 32 dots under Tourism and 38 under Community, so the question is would it have been helpful to see the tabloid first before seeing the boards?

Focus Group Participant 2: Explained that now reading the tabloid is more important to her, because she has an idea of why she is going to read it. If she gets something big like that in the mail, it is like she doesn't know why and would recycle.

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that he agreed; this is better first.

Chairman Thompson then referenced the introductory videos, and indicated that he would like to know the group's reaction to the short one with the big band music to get everybody awake. He assumes that served its purpose okay, but the second one that talked about the process and the E, T, C, did you find that to be useful?

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that was good.

Focus Group Participant 4: Stated, "Yes, it was very helpful."

John Sather indicated that there was a comment about the big band music maybe being a little old fogey for young people.

Focus Group Participant 7: Indicated no, not at all. It is coming back; it really is.

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that the only thing that felt awkward to him was the transition between the two, by going back to the computer screen, so if there is a way . . . , and he knows that someone is supposed to say something and make an introduction in-between, but if those both could be put into a PowerPoint or something, so you went to a black slide in-between to just fade it out, someone could get up, and then it would just start up again, and it would seem much more professional.

Chairman Thompson noted that is an excellent point.

Focus Group Participant 6: Indicated that she was a little startled about the image of the wildlife with the deer on the sprinkled lawn, but then again it is the city, but at first it was a bit disturbing.

Focus Group Participant 1: Noted that there were two images that bugged her a little bit, when you are talking about the Community Plan, you had 2002, which for people who weren't here then would ask what relevance that has. It looked like you put the wrong one in there, so she thinks she would blank that out. Also, when you talked about recycling and greening, you had a great picture of the dump with garbage coming out, and you go from this majesty to like not a pretty thing. She would like to see something better about greening, like kids picking up cans or the litter lifters, etc., something a little more aesthetic, and she has to go back to that big band, because it may be popular and all, but for her, it just didn't pick up the ambience of the visuals. It was punchy and lively, this is true, but she didn't really particularly think it was in keeping with the selection of your photos, as a personal thing.

Focus Group Participant 9: Indicated that she understood the 2002 thing, because right afterward, he said that it comes up every 10 years, so for her, it was automatically like oh, 2002 and now we are doing it in 2012, if that was why you had it in there.

Focus Group Participant 3: Pointed out that is our existing Community Plan.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he is hearing some rough edges to smooth out in transitions and things like that, and that is all good.

Focus Group Participant 3: Asked how much time the group had, 15 or 20 minutes, so how much time are they going to have.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he would explain, and then get the group's reaction to it. The Committee's thought was that people will probably interact with this at different paces, and some may get frustrated by the crowd, etc., and just want to leave, so trying to get everybody back together at the end for a follow-up doesn't make a lot of sense, so the thought was once people are sent to the boards, they know they can spend as much time as they want, and there will be proctors or assistance to help them, but when they are ready to leave, they can leave. Given that, the Chairman asked if that made sense and how much time do you think you would have spent if you had been in that situation, knowing you have the tabloid. Some of you might think you would like to do it all right now. He then asked how many of the group would have liked to have read this and do the tabloid, leave it and be done at this meeting versus the idea of taking it home, studying it and returning it.

Focus Group Participant 9: Indicated that she liked the idea that it is both, because this is a great presentation. It is wonderful and gets the social aspect going; it is really great, but if it is too much of a crowd, the tabloid is perfect, so she likes the idea that you have given both. It makes sense, but if more people want to go home and do the little blue dots, sure, but then they can go home and think about it and talk about it with their family and friends.

Chairman Thompson then asked if she liked the ability to do both and she stated yes, absolutely.

Focus Group Participant 4: Stated, "Yes."

Focus Group Participant 6: Indicated that she liked the opportunity to do it later.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he was glad to hear that people are serious about it, because it is a lot.

Focus Group Participant 3: Indicated that his sense was that some people will do their thing and leave, but hopefully, what will happen even more than he observed here is that you will get dialogues and people talking, so his guess is that there is going to be a smaller proportion of people hanging out longer periods talking about it, maybe still doing a little bit, but given that you are not going to do any wrap-up and just let people sort of peter out of here, he thinks it might be a nice idea to have one or two of the Committee Members by the door, so you are greeting them, thanking them and encouraging them to do the workbook, so they have a sense that they are not just sneaking out and it really is sort of a yes, you are important and we really want you to do this.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the Committee has that covered; we are going to catch people as they leave. John Sather added that we probably also need to control their expectation that they are not going to be called back to their chair, and once they do this they are free to leave, so it is not confusing.

Focus Group Participant 2: Explained that it was hard for her to have a lot of dialogue, because she was trying to read everything and absorb it. When she is reading, she can't multi-task anymore, so she didn't dialogue as much as maybe the Committee had hoped, because she wasn't finished absorbing it.

Chairman Thompson agreed and said that is okay.

Focus Group Participant 4: Indicated that is a good comment and he would suggest that the Committee emphasize the fact that you can complete this online, as opposed to sending it back.

Focus Group Participant 1: Indicated that she would use some visual prompts at the door to say remember to fill-out and return to wherever by mail or online, so people have it as they take it with them. Also for starters, she was thinking that there is always going to be new people and it is a good idea to give them even a little bit of an intro to that video, maybe five minutes or three minutes, but just set them up for the timeline of what has happened and what it is, in very staccato little sentences, so that anybody that just meandered into this process . . . , because she gets the feeling, and she mentioned this to John Sather, that you folks have put so much time and effort into this thing for months and months, and some for years, and you are so close to it, she thinks sometimes you forget that for a lot of folks, the name Sedona Community Plan is still quite vague, and so before they even get to this process, she thinks she would just bullet, boom, boom, boom, and this is where we are folks and welcome to all the new people that maybe just are catching up now. She thinks you always have to keep that in mind each time.

Chairman Thompson noted, kind of a "you are here" and asked if there is anything else.

Focus Group Participant 9: Mentioned that she and Focus Group Participant 7 were invited by Barbara, because she wanted a voice of mothers in town, and she just took over as the Director of Teen Programs at the YMCA, so if she were to bring a group of teens, although she is not here on the 19th, but if she finds a way to get a group of teens involved as well, is it open for that. She has a group already, a core group of about 10 kids who are so involved in what they want to see happening here.

Chairman Thompson explained that the Committee has talked on several occasions about how concerned the Committee is that we haven't gotten enough of the youth's input. We had several times when people from the schools have come.

Focus Group Participant 9: Commented that they know those kids, they were up there . . .

Chairman Thompson continued to say that has been terrific, but as far as he is concerned, if someone can read that newspaper, they can fill it out and send it in.

Focus Group Participant 9: Stated, "Wonderful."

Focus Group Participant 10: Indicated that she wanted to echo that as the K - 8 Principal and also as a parent, she has been in the district for a long time. The Committee did a lot of work for the students. We had every single student at West Sedona give input more than once, so she feels that they have got a huge piece of this. She felt super honored that they were allowed to do that, then two of the students made a presentation, so that is pretty great and she would like to hook up with Focus Group Participant 9 and see, and she would also like to say that we want to see representation in all of that in our cities and towns.

Chairman Thompson indicated that is great to hear and all of that was input that the Committee put back into this, so now it is just as important that we get as many of all of the Sedonans to tell us if we saw the right things, did we put things up here that really resonate with you and which way we should go.

Focus Group Participant 1: Asked if there has been any outreach to the Hispanic community in any way and what the response has been.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the Committee had a couple of programs that were translated and some materials translated at one point. After we have the three presentations, these are going to pop-up in a couple of different places like at New Frontiers one afternoon to catch people walking in and we are going to have them up at St. John Vianney at one of the services there, and there is another event where we are advertising to the people to come out.

Mike Bower indicated that maybe a specific answer for her question is in the Community vision for the high school area, vo-tech training was a direct recommendation of the Hispanic community and they were pretty focused on some real practical things that would help them that just don't exist educationally, so the Committee got some good comments and incorporated several of those in there.

Focus Group Participant 10: Noted that their school is one-half Hispanic and also there is a mass that is all in Spanish at St. John Vianney too.

Mike Bower noted that there is one dot on the E, T, C circles and that is the one that Chairman Thompson put in Community, and in one way, it might be a question of do you think you should have to put a dot just somewhere on that board to show the gauge of where you are leaning, or is that not necessary?

Focus Group Participant 2: Indicated that would be nice; she just didn't get that far.

Focus Group Participant 7: Stated that she ran out of dots. Several other focus group members indicated that they also ran out of dots.

John Sather suggested that one dot be reserved as a final preference indicator.

Focus Group Participant 4: Indicated that is not a bad idea.

Chairman Thompson asked if it is clear that you can put your dot in the all green, all brown or all blue area or in the areas between them, and the group indicated yes.

Focus Group Participant 2: Indicated that in the skit, it was mentioned that you could also put dots on the common elements too, and she doesn't know if the Committee is going to continue the skit or whatever, but it was nice to know that you could add dots there as well.

Focus Group Participant 8: Suggested having somebody stationed by that board (with three overlapping circles) with different color dots, so everybody would know they have one more.

John Sather and Chairman Thompson indicated that is a good idea.

At 4:35 p.m., the Chairman indicated that the focus group could leave and expressed how grateful the Committee is for them taking the time and how helpful it has been to the Committee. He knows the programs next week will be much better, because of their input. He then asked the Committee to reassemble to continue the meeting.

At 4:40 p.m., the Chairman resumed the meeting and Marty Losoff asked if the Committee is going to discuss anything. The Chairman explained that is agenda item 7.

6. Discussion/possible action on committee "Current Activities and Understandings" document and the planning process. (5 minutes 4:25 – 4:30 p.m.)

Chairman Thompson indicated that he hoped the Committee had a chance to look at it. There are a lot of little changes here and there, but almost everything is a matter of changing things that have happened to things that did happen. Jim Eaton indicated that in that case he would move that we dispense with it.

The Chairman indicated that he didn't want to dispense with it, but he will call for a vote and entertain a motion to accept the January 3, 2013 "Current Activities and Understandings" document. Vice Chairman Robson asked before moving on that if there is anything in it that the Committee needs to know has changed.

Chairman Thompson explained that the most substantive change, other than things that have happened and were turned into things that did happen, is on the second page just before item 3, "Substantial prizes to be given from a random drawing of the return response section at our Citizens Steering Committee meeting on February 5th". That was something the Outreach Subcommittee decided, because one of the prizes is passes to the Film Festival and we can't wait until another meeting to give them out, so we decided that the best thing to do was have that drawing on the 5th, and he has in mind a way to hit the right meetings and numbers and whatever, so we can do the drawing on the 5th. Other than that, they are just changed to bring them up to date.

The Chairman again stated that he would entertain a motion.

MOTON: Vice Chairman Robson so moved (to accept the January 3, 2013 Current Activities and Understandings document). Angela LeFevre seconded the motion. VOTE: Motion carried eight (8) for and zero (0) opposed. Barbara Litrell and Judy Reddington were excused; Elemer Magaziner was absent.

7. Discussion/possible action on the presentation in agenda item # 5 and the feedback received from the focus group. (20 minutes 4:30 – 4:50 p.m.)

Vice Chairman Robson indicated that the role playing was interesting, but he noticed that the people started to lose their enthusiasm as the role playing progressed past a minute, so that is really important to watch, because you want people to be really enthusiastic when they go to the boards, and after they saw the video and got a little overview, they were ready to ram the boards, and then as the role playing went on and on and on, everybody kind of went okay, so that is his input of what he saw on that.

Angela LeFevre indicated that the role playing is a great idea, but it has to be done well. It wasn't, and she can understand that you just got it this morning, so if it is done well and it is shortened, people get the idea. You maybe take one of the areas and each of you take one of the boards and represent that area and say you like this one, and the great idea is the cultural park, because everybody knows the cultural park and this is what you think of it this way, etc., so you can see from that, and then go back to presenter to say that this shows you how the three different three visions work and this is what you to do with each one or whatever. Just segue into this is how three different people can look and support different ways of looking at things. It is a great idea, because it is real and not like watching a movie, as long as it is done well and you speak clearly and not just chat between each other, and make it quite clear as to what you are saying, great stuff and people will be ready to do that.

Jim Eaton indicated that there was way too much time spent talking; the role playing is a good idea, but it should be limited to one comparison and a maximum of ten minutes to give them the idea of what they are supposed to do, but let's have a lot less talk before they are released to go to the boards.

Marty Losoff indicated that the Commission should hear what the people said. A couple of people said it was a waste of time and most others nodded, so he doesn't know. It is a good idea in principle, but let them get up there. The good thing about planning is you don't want it too structured. Even in role playing, just by going through some of the things, you are planting ideas and if you go to the cultural park, people may go to the cultural park first and he doesn't think we want that to happen, so he would rather see a free flow and skip the role playing.

Marty also stated that secondly, we were talking about people could just leave at the end, but there should be some closure, whether in a group where everybody gets together at the end or as they are leaving, we have a table and something there with us or whoever, to have some closure to the event, so it is not just okay I'm done and gone. Some kind of closure, not just when you are

finished you can leave. Thirdly, we are giving mixed messages. We talked about a start and finish and it was mentioned that they could start anywhere, and he thought we wanted them to come to the common elements and work their way around, and end up at the three circles, so if that has changed, he guesses that is okay and he can understand with the masses that we may not be able to do that.

Marty then summarized that those are three things. First, we should not have a role play. Second, we should have a closure and third, let's talk about the flow. Chairman Thompson indicated that the Committee will try to address each of those.

John Sather stated that last week we said that we were going to take the words "Start here" off and made that decision last time, and we said that it was going to be open. The "Start here" was only going to be when this is self-explanatory. It can't be start here, because one of the problems is going to be crowd control, and in the gymnasium . . . , we just had a few people here today, and with three times the number of people, they couldn't be near here, so do the boards stand if they are in a line?

Mike Raber explained that they need a little bit of a bend. John Sather then stated that his point is they can't start there, because with a crowd it doesn't work. Mike Raber then asked what happens to the common elements, and Mike Bower explained that you only cover the words "Start here".

John Sather then indicated that he agrees about the role playing; we can do away with it or go to one example. Focus group participant 1 had a lot of comments about taking this slide out and that slide out, but he doubts that we want to be doing that right now. His other question is a technical question; after the end of meeting one, are we peeling off all of the dots? Mike Raber and Mike Bower stated yes and Mike Raber explained that we are going to take a picture of it.

John Sather then asked who is going to do that, he is talking about peeling off 1,000 dots. Mike Raber explained that once we take a picture of it, we can just peel them off. Marty Losoff asked if there is any value to leaving them on.

John Sather indicated that there is going to be a crowd control issue on dots, so like on walkability there are four now, and if you multiply this audience by 10, that can be a blob there and we are going to have to tell them that is okay. Mike Bower added, or we limit the number of dots. John then stated that regarding the idea of an additional dot at the end, he thought that we should have two or three or four of those boards at the exit as they are leaving, and you hand one dot out and say put one more on your final preferences as you leave. He wants four of them or something for crowd control again.

Jim Eaton indicated that it was very gratifying that nobody felt that they were told what to do, because that has been a concern and nobody felt that way. Secondly, he doesn't think it was explained quite well enough that the things on the start panel has no debate on them; they don't have vote on those, so they can save their dots for things that are real choices, because those are things that ultimately will go into the Plan.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that in terms of blocking something with a big blotch of blue dots on one item, somebody will have to be in control and say okay, there are 50 dots there so take those 50 down, but record it, so there is room for other dots. There has to be some sort of control; however, Chairman Thompson stated to let them overflow, because the point is not to have a count, the point is to have the community interacting and seeing what they are thinking, and if you pull them down, you may have people say nobody put anything there, halfway through the meeting.

Mike Raber stated that if we take pictures of that, we will see visually what is being stressed and John Sather added that we don't have to worry about that. Gerhard Mayer then stated that it is like a cloud. Chairman Thompson added that this is the least statistical thing the Committee is doing and that is the way he looks at it.

Mike Bower referenced Marty Losoff's comment about closure and indicated that the finish of the E, T, C, and maybe we are going back to the orange dot idea, but that could exist at the exit door with a couple of Committee Members there to ensure they got the tabloid and ask them to do a general weigh-in on that diagram. Chairman Thompson then asked Marty Losoff if, when he spoke about closure, he felt a necessity for a group closure, and Marty explained that he didn't like telling people that when they are done, they can leave, because we should have some type of closure, whether it is like Mike Bower just described or something else, so they know what is going to happen next.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the Outreach Subcommittee talked about having at least a couple of people stationed at the doors and as people came out they would have a checklist of two or three things that they are charged with trying to ask everybody leaving, so they would get that, but this might be an extra wonderful thing to do too. We wouldn't have to give them orange dots; we have the orange dots as they leave, and they would have to go through a narrow passageway to place one more dot, if they are willing to do that, and tell us if they got everything they needed and remind them to send the form back or whatever.

Marty Losoff indicated that whether we do it individually or collectively, people want to know what is going to happen next. John Sather added or do they leave now; we need to make it clear that when they do that, they can leave. Chairman Thompson then noted that before we send them to the boards, we need to tell them and indicate this is what is going to happen next.

Gerhard Mayer suggested that when the dots are handed out, there is one that is a different color and you let them know that this dot is a special dot for the end. Chairman Thompson explained that the suggestion was not to have the dot handed out to them and, at the end, tell them that when they leave there is an orange dot to put on the board. Gerhard Mayer stated that he would give it to them right away, because it is a special dot to use on their way out, because if they pass by, you aren't going to force them to take the dot.

Angela LeFevre explained that when she has been to these kinds of meetings, something like this is a lot of input and they have been going around, maybe some will also be chatting, and they are going to get all of this input, so she thinks most people would want the chance to stand in a group and chat about it, and she doesn't know if we are going to have cookies or anything there, but that is the way you do it, and the cookies and stuff would be separate and towards the exist, and that is where people and Committee Members can gather, and that also is where you give them the other dot right before they leave. This dot is for finishing their final vote, but in the meantime, let's chat, so there could be a table there with cookies and they can talk, because that gives them a chance to discuss it more and ask some questions. We can also stress the fact that they need the tabloid and return it, and give them that if they haven't already got it, etc, so they know at the end what they have to do and what is expected of them. We can't just let them filter out without that kind of input.

Chairman Thompson indicated that there have been some good comments and ideas, so he asked if it is okay to let the Outreach Subcommittee on Thursday morning figure out the specific logistics of all of that. John Sather asked who is supposed to do the welcome and Chairman Thompson indicated that it was supposed to be Mike Bower. Mike then stated that he will gladly do that; it is the welcome between the two videos.

John Sather then stated that he is going to do the overview, and then somebody else is going to decide if we are doing the role playing or not. Chairman Thompson suggested resolving that here. John Sather then asked if it is clear as to how the bigger group is going to get their dots and Mike Raber indicated that needs to be figured out. John then stated that he wants to be sure to have all of these things, because we have been giving some meetings that we haven't been very prepared for. Mike Bower suggested they could be at the door and handed out as they come in.

Chairman Thompson again stated that the Outreach Subcommittee can walk through the exact logistics and where it is going to be, etc., but let's talk about the role play. Mike Bower stated that he doesn't feel any need to do it and he wrote that because he said he would at the Program

Subcommittee meeting. The things we were trying to address was only trying to respond to all of these other meetings we had, and the confusion between Tourism and Economy and between Sustainability and Environment; those were two things that were supposedly addressed in there, and then a little of just coming off of your mark and changing your opinion, but he really thinks we can just let them have at it. We need to give a little better presentation of the evening's agenda and we can just hit on these eight things in a presentation upfront. We got into this mindset that we don't have to do anything, because Jim's video is great and it is, but his sense is that we need a brief presentation that clarifies some stuff.

Chairman Thompson indicated that there was something else in the video that was very clear, but one of the people mentioned that you ought to talk about it; it was to go through where we have been, and that was there, but the point is that we need to say things over again, and we don't have to go into nearly as much depth, because the video is doing it for just about everybody.

Mike Bower indicated that he is going to conclude to scrap the role play from his perspective and Chairman Thompson asked if everyone was in agreement to scrap the role play; the consensus was yes.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that the points he wanted to make about Economy and Tourism should be included in the introduction, because people might get the wrong impression. Mike Bower explained that we may have to let that be some mentoring at the board if we hear that; otherwise, we have to just let it happen. It is too much information and in a way he thought what the Chairman did with the tabloid was too much information. It is there, take it home, pull it out and send it in.

Marty Losoff indicated that to expedite, do these things have to be taken back to Outreach? Most of us are here, so can we decide on the final dots and how many. The Chairman indicated that we can if the Committee wants, but it is 4:57 p.m. and we have several other items. Marty Losoff then stated that if it goes to Outreach, then it comes back and we could just get it done. The Chairman explained that he was just suggesting a way to speed up things, so if you want to resolve them here, we can. We want to talk about the outreach opportunities, because we need to sign-up for a bunch of different things, and the Parks & Rec. Master Plan, which we can put off one more time, but we have to do it next time. Gerhard Mayer also pointed out that we have to take the panels down.

Marty Losoff indicated that he would be curious, given the presentation today, about John's comment about taking the dots off and if there is an advantage to leaving the dots up for each presentation. What if we leave the dots up, so they just accumulate? John Sather stated that he wouldn't like them there for the next meeting, because then you are leading them. Chairman Thompson noted that was discussed earlier.

Mike Bower stated that if we photograph them, we should take them off, but Gerhard Mayer's idea of taking some off mid-meeting is something we should hope we can avoid, and that brings up the question of is it an unlimited number of dots or does everybody have to be selective with 7 - 10 dots. Gerhard Mayer then asked if it could be leading to have so many dots in one spot and Mike stated that it is not leading if they are leading it -- that is our goal, to let the people lead.

Vice Chairman Robson stated that if the dots are limited, then the boards need to be rotated, because if you start here, and then go to Environment and like that, and you have limited dots, you are going to start putting your dots there and not have any dots further out. Mike Raber noted that is their choice though.

Chairman Thompson indicated that if he got anything out of this in terms of the way the people behaved, they just were very comfortable sticking dots up, so why are we laboring over how many dots we are going to count or if they are going to have enough or whatever. You gave them some dots and they were happy doing dots, and if they ran out, they said they needed some more dots, so give them a couple of more dots. This is not the added up part of it; this is not a statistical

process. This is for people to see the kind of trends that are going on and to get discussion going, so what is in his head gets put out somewhere, because they can't talk at the same time, which is what focus group participant 2 was saying, and the person next to her asked, "Why did you put your dot there?" That is all we want with dots. Donna Puckett noted that one person borrowed a dot from another person, and the Chairman stated that we are the only ones hung up about dots.

Mike Raber stated that the Committee had this discussion in the Program Subcommittee about handing out more dots, and maybe we ought to be clear about whether or not that is okay. Jim Eaton indicated that he heard several people say they would like red dots for things they don't like and that is an opportunity for a visceral-like reaction and probably more valid than just thinking it is kind of nice, so stick a blue dot on it. We ought to consider a limited supply of red dots.

Chairman Thompson indicated that is a huge discussion and Mike Bower indicated that his reaction is that if they don't like something then they need to write a good detailed description in the tabloid return, and ideally not just say they hate it, but say what they don't like; for example, they didn't like this comment or this statement or defining principle and would rather see it worded this way, because you need to keep people in the positive. A dilemma that you certainly experienced on P&Z, etc., is where we are all about negativity. We have all of these goals and policies, but nobody wants any growth, just say no to all growth, and what we are trying to build is the things we can say yes to, so the negative dot idea can be feng-shuied into a good comment sheet, instead of putting a red dot there -- write us something more studied and why you don't like it. Jim Eaton indicated that he agrees it is too easy, but we should make that point when we are handing out the tabloid to please use the comment section to make comments pro or con. Mike Raber agreed.

Mike Bower stated that regarding the number of dots, he is still an advocate of a limit, because of dot management. Gerhard Mayer's or John Sather's observation is true that four are on there, but if we have 40, it could be a lot, and if we have a bigger crowd, we could have 40 dots in any one place, and then Gerhard Mayer is right that we are going to have to come and pry them off to be able to read what is there, so to manage that is to limit the dots and that also makes them kind of special, and you read everything, you don't just start slathering them on the Environment board, because you read that first. You don't put any dots down for a while, you study it. Gerhard Mayer pointed out that you have to let people know that you only get seven dots, so read them first.

Chairman Thompson asked what the number is and Jim Eaton noted that if you ration the dots, they have to make some real choices. Mike Raber indicated that they were given twelve today. Chairman Thompson asked if the number is seven, and if so, that is a lot of cutting in preparation. Vice Chairman Robson stated that the 12 used today looks perfect; however, Mike Bower pointed out that could be cut in half to six or nine.

Chairman Thompson asked if Mike Bower is saying that 12 is too many and Mike stated that whatever the easy cut is for the sheet that gets it to the 9 - 10 range, or 12 could be okay. If 12 is all we did today, maybe we need more dot management, so try nine.

Focus Group Participant 8: Stated that she noticed that there is like 10 specific thoughts and she liked being able to vote for one of the ten on each scenario. She wanted to be able to vote on each scenario once, and you can't do that with nine, and then that gave her a couple of more to put where she wanted to emphasize, and she thinks the young lady had one of the best comments, in that she realized, and the Committee should emphasize this in the beginning, that this is just a general thing, and if you have real comments to make, you do it in the tabloid. Chairman Thompson noted that he could have kissed her and other Committee Members agreed. Focus Group Participant 8 then repeated that is the thing the Committee needs to emphasize.

Marty Losoff asked what the Committee is trying to achieve with the dots; if we are taking a vote that is one thing, if we are trying to get some consensus of people's thoughts and ideas that is another, so whether they have 10, 20 or 9 dots, what are we trying to accomplish by dot

management, and then he asked if we are looking for consensus and Mike Bower said, "Impressions".

John Sather wanted to rephrase that, and asked if this focus group was all we had, what would we do with what we have, what would be our tea-leaf reading? His would be that they are pretty equal in their weighting of these and as he studies them, some things are reaffirmation of what we believed early on for walkability, etc., so we would highlight those and have them in our mind as we write the Plan, and he has always said that this boils down to asking them a simple question. Give us some preference, some meter reading on where you are at on these, and as he watched this, early on he thought Tourism was going to be driven out of town, because most of those dots came late in the dot thing, and people weren't just going one, two, three, they were scattered immediately, so that is an answer to your question.

Angela LeFevre recalled one participant's comment and indicated that she thinks one way they picked up support was basically because of the way people moved around. She then asked what we are going to do to control the crowd. She has been thinking about how it could work, and if we have 60 people, we could divide them into three groups with 20 in each group and they could start anywhere, so one is Tourism, and we do E, T and C with them, and they start in three different places, but she is worried that people will flock to one or two areas, and one area won't be done, and then everybody will go to it at the end and realize they hadn't been to it. She is just thinking of different scenarios that could happen and would that help the flow by having people start at different places.

Mike Bower indicated no and explained that their role as Committee Members, if there is a big cluster at one of them, is to shuffle some people to the other boards, because the more we can keep it open and fluid the better. Angela LeFevre then stated that is where she comes from, but she wanted to see what you thought.

Marty Losoff stated that we are still talking about dots and Mike Raber indicated that he was going to change the topic anyway. Chairman Thompson also noted that the Committee needs to move on to item 8.

Mike Raber indicated that the crowd control issue has come up a couple of times and Mike Bower has advocated for having a couple of set-ups, at least at the West Sedona School, and we can do that. We can use the one that was going to go to the library along with this, but it is a big job to set them up. John Sather stated that there should be two and we were even discussing that there should be two here. Chairman Thompson noted that the first meeting on the 16th is going to be here, and he thinks we are going to have a lot of people.

John Sather then described a way to do it by moving out all of the chairs after the participants get up. Mike Raber pointed out where a second set-up could be placed, with the chairs moved out. Mike Bower asked how flat the boards can be and Gerhard Mayer indicated they need an angle. They then discussed where the displays could be placed and flattened a little more, and still leave some access in the back. Chairman Thompson noted that some volunteers are going to be needed and that this may be the best place to segue to the next agenda item.

Gerhard Mayer indicated that he will make some improvements for the set-up and Mike Raber indicated that four volunteers would be ideal. John Sather suggested hiring some laborers and Mike Raber indicated that we could pull some Public Works employees in to help if necessary.

8. Discussion/possible action on public outreach opportunities for the January 2013 community meetings. (10 minutes – 4:50 – 5:00 p.m.)

Mike Raber indicated that there is an issue with some of the sandwich signs that are going out for special events, primarily on the 13th and 15th, and then we have the pop-up displays and the staffing at the Community Room.

Chairman Thompson asked Cynthia to read everything needed first, so the Committee knows what we have to do. This is critically important and we cannot continue to work with just the people who are volunteering to help. There is a lot of physical stuff involved and presence at the community room, plus the pop-ups, etc., so you really need to assess what you can volunteer for.

Cynthia indicated that volunteers are needed for the following:

- Set-up of sandwich board signs at the concerts on the 13th at St. John Vianney and another one at a concert on the 15th, so that would just be taking it, dropping it off and picking it up. Mike Raber stated that he can drop the one off on the 15th after a Citizens Steering Committee meeting, but someone will need to pick it up.
- Pop-up events at New Frontiers on the 23rd and St. John Vianney on the 27th
- Volunteers for this set-up, and after today, she thinks four would be optimal to set up one of these displays, so four would be needed at each of the three meetings.
- Open Community Plan Room from the 28th to the 31st, so people are needed to be there and we were thinking of 2-hour time slots. Chairman Thompson added three of them a day.
- Help picking up the sandwich board signs on the 18th, and we will have dropped them off at eight different locations around town, but that would just be driving around and throwing them in.

Chairman Thompson indicated that he had indicated his availability for all of the Community Plan Room times; he is willing to be there for all of those sessions, all four days and all three sessions. He will just bring something to do, so if anybody else wants to join him that is fine, but you can mark that one as covered. Angela LeFevre indicated that she can be there Wednesday and Thursday from 2:00 p.m. to 4:00 p.m.

Mike Raber asked that they respond on the Doodle site, so they will have that. Marty Losoff then requested an email of the list of things and Mike Bower indicated that Gerhard Mayer shouldn't have to be responsible for all of the set-up, so if staff can get Public Works, that would be great, and if not, we should try to find some local contractors with skills to volunteer to do the pop-ups.

Gerhard Mayer explained the improvements he is going to make for more stability, and Mike Bower suggested that they check with Public Works right away and he will try to find some contractor volunteers for those dates. Cynthia noted that Dan Neimy had offered help.

Chairman Thompson noted that a volunteer is still needed to drop off sandwich boards at the Chamber Music Concert at St. John Vianney. Mike Raber repeated he can drop it off on the 15th, but somebody needs to pick it up, and he doesn't know if we can pick them up the next day at the high school or not, we may want to call and find out.

Marty Losoff explained that he needed to see the full list, before he can sign up. Mike Raber indicated that he will send the full list out one more time, because we want to get more participation, especially for the pop-ups. Cynthia added that four people are needed to set things up; however, Mike explained that Public Works may be able to help, but somebody needs to stay there.

Angela LeFevre noted that New Frontiers is on the 23rd and asked what is required, once the stuff is set-up, and for how long. Mike Bower stated two hours and Mike Raber added, at least. Angela LeFevre stated that she can do that.

Mike Bower indicated that he had mentioned handing out dots, but Mike Raber indicated that he didn't think we were doing dots; however, it seems that we might as well do dots at the pop-ups. Angela asked if we were going to be there to answer questions and get responses and Chairman Thompson stated that the person will have tabloids and dots.

Chairman Thompson then suggested that if staff doesn't get the volunteers needed after the email goes out again to give him a call and he will call people and ask.

9. Discussion/possible action on the draft Parks and Recreation Master Plan (10 minutes – 5:00 – 5:10 p.m.)

Marty Losoff suggested putting this item first on the agenda next time, and the Chairman noted that it has to be done the next time.

There was no further discussion on this item.

10. Discussion regarding future meeting dates and future agenda items. (5 minutes – 5:10 – 5:15 p.m.)

Tuesday, January 15, 2013

Tuesday, January 29, 2013

Mike Raber noted that we also want to talk about the facilitation training, and the Chairman stated that the next meeting will be on the 15th, so we will put facilitation training and talk about people at the exit and what they are going to do. When people are at the boards, we also want to capture some of their comments and be able to assist them. Barbara Litrell has written a document that is kind of a FAQ. Mike Raber noted that he has copies that he can distribute.

Chairman Thompson indicated that the meeting will be in the Community Plan Room a week from today and that will be our last chance to fine-tune anything and get our training on facilitation. We will not have a meeting on the 22nd, but we will meet on the 29th, and those of you who have the current calendar, the last one he saw may be wrong for the meeting dates, so note that there is no Citizens Steering Committee meeting on the 22nd, and if your calendar says there is, move it to the 29th.

Marty Losoff referenced an article in the paper last week titled, "*Mesa Wants to Create a Town Square, ASU Students to Help Design Urban Public Gathering Spot*", and he would like to circulate it and maybe put it on a future agenda to help get off of the process discussions and broaden our horizons to talk about ideas like this. It is a great article and he would suggest discussing it on the 29th.

Chairman Thompson then confirmed that the Program Working Team is still going to meet tomorrow at 4:00 p.m.

11. Adjournment.

The Chairman adjourned the meeting at 5:24 p.m., without objection.

I certify that the above is a true and correct summary of the meeting of the Citizens Steering Committee held on January 3, 2013.

Donna A. S. Puckett, *Recording Secretary*

Date